## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 17-CR-100-WMC

DAVID TJADER,

Madison, Wisconsin July 2, 2018

Defendant.

1:09 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
HELD BEFORE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE WILLIAM M. CONLEY

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney BY: ELIZABETH ALTMAN Assistant United States Attorney 222 West Washington Avenue, Suite 700 Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Jones Law Firm

BY: WILLIAM R. JONES

P.O. Box 44188

Madison, Wisconsin 53744

Also appearing: DAVID TJADER, Defendant

MARIAH JOHNSON, U.S. Probation Officer

Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC U.S. District Court Federal Reporter United States District Court 120 North Henry Street, Rm. 410 Madison, Wisconsin 53703 (608) 261-5709

```
(Proceedings called to order at 1:09 p.m.)
 1
 2
                THE CLERK: Case No. 17-CR-100-WMC-1, United States of
       America v. David Tjader. Court is called for a sentencing.
 3
            May we have the appearances, please.
 4
 5
                MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. The United
 6
       States appears by Elizabeth Altman.
 7
                MR. JONES: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mr. Tjader is
       here in person and with his attorney, William Jones.
 8
 9
                THE COURT: Good afternoon, all.
10
            We are here for a sentencing of David Tjader --
11
                THE DEFENDANT: Tjader.
12
                THE COURT: Tjader. Thank you. And my first
13
       obligation, Mr. Tjader, is to ask whether you've had an
14
       opportunity to read and discuss the presentence report and the
15
       addendum and revised presentence report with your counsel?
16
                THE DEFENDANT: One second. Was the revised one what
17
       we just went over?
18
                MR. JONES: Yeah.
19
                THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Yes.
20
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you. Then I'll ask the government if
       there was an additional motion -- or a motion for an additional
21
22
       one-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility?
2.3
                MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Also, if you could advise me, Ms. Altman,
24
25
       whether or not there were any victims who wished to speak.
```

2.3

MS. ALTMAN: There are no victims that wish to speak, Your Honor. We did comply with our notification obligations.

THE COURT: Understood. And I saw that you filed under seal victim statements.

With that, I will accept the plea agreement finding that the offense of conviction adequately reflects the defendant's criminal conduct and the plea agreement does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing. In determining the defendant's sentence, I will take into consideration the advisory sentencing guidelines and be governed by the statutory purposes of sentencing that is set forth at Section 3553(a) of Title 18.

While the government had no objections to the presentence report, the defendant raised an objection to the number of images included in the guideline calculation, asserting that because devices seized from the defendant's residence were not in working order, the images found on these computers should not be considered for relevant conduct. Further clarification from the case agent, however, indicates that these devices were not only operable but were actually navigable and that images found on the devices were easily accessible by a user. Moreover, they reflect what would have been viewed in the past, and I don't see any reason to exclude them. Therefore, the defendant would have been able to access these images at any time or at least at some period of time, and they accurately are considered for purposes

of determining relevant conduct.

2.3

The defendant further asserts that a downward departure is warranted for a number of the images used because the video-to-image conversion utilized by the guideline is arbitrary and overstates the quantity of images involved in the offense. The Court further recognizes that this calculation can overstate the severity of the defendant's conduct, and it will consider this when determining the appropriate sentence. At the same time, it will consider that there may have been live visual depiction of particularly horrific form as well.

The defendant also raised several objections regarding the language used in the presentence report claiming it misleads the reader in making false assumptions about the defendant.

Similarly, the defendant objected to the use of the information provided by the defendant to the polygraph examiner. However, the defendant's statements and information provided are appropriate to consider, not only because they were included in the investigative materials but because they represent information willingly provided to investigators by the defendant. Moreover, the defendant's success on supervision depends on his willingness to address his specific risks and treatment needs and to ensure that he will not be a danger to the community upon his release from prison. The defendant's statements have been noted in the report. However, I believe the information from investigative materials were appropriately

included as well.

2.3

Finally, the defendant raised several objections to the proposed special conditions of supervised release numbered 12, 13, 14, 16, and 19. Justification for those conditions will be addressed following the imposition of sentencing today. All of the imposed conditions address risks that are occasioned by the offense of conviction and the defendant's personal history and characteristics.

Accordingly, I find the probation office has calculated the advisory guidelines correctly using the current manual and supplement and taking into account all relevant conduct under Section 1B1.3. The guideline for receipt of child pornography in violation of Section 2252(a)(2) of Title 18 is found at Section 2G2.2. Under subsection 2(a)(2), the base offense level is 22.

However, under subsection 2(b)(1), two levels are removed because there is no evidence to suggest that the defendant intended to further traffic or distribute the images and videos that he received.

In contrast, two levels are added under subsection 2(b)(2) because one image and two videos retrieved from the defendant's email contain minor females ranging in age from 6 to 12 years.

Under subsection 2(b)(4), four levels are also added because some of the materials portray bondage, sadism, and violent sexual abuse or exploitation of an infant or toddler.

2.3

Two more levels are added because the defendant utilized his computer and various online accounts and servers to receive child pornography under subsection 2(b)(6).

Finally, under subsection 2(b)(7)(D) and comment note 6(B), five levels are added because the offense involved 138 images and 118 videos, nearly 9,000 images in total.

No other Chapter Two adjustments apply, and while the Court will consider the totality of defendant's conduct when determining if further reduction should be granted under Section 5K2.0 for enhancement for the number of images possessed or received under 2G2.2(b)(7), the defendant has viewed child pornography for an extended period. He admitted beginning to view child pornography as early as 2002 with some interruptions. Much more disturbing to the Court, investigative material suggests he solicited certain kinds of graphic and live images of sexual abuse of minors, including images in exchange for payment. Given this active promotion of the creation of horrific child pornography as well as the number of images on devices in his possession at the time of the search warrant, a five-level increase, I believe, is warrant.

Accordingly, while the defendant did not qualify for enhancement for a pattern of conduct under 4B1.5, neither does his criminal history underrepresent under Section 4A1.3.

Therefore, no further adjustments are warranted for images, although I will, as I've said, consider the totality of the

circumstances under Section 3553(a).

2.3

The defendant does qualify for a three-level downward adjustment under Section 3E1.1 because he demonstrated acceptance of responsibility for his offense and the government has moved for the additional reduction.

With a total offense level of 20 [verbatim] and a criminal history category of I, therefore, the defendant would ordinarily have an advisory guideline imprisonment range of 97 to 121 months. However, as has been the practice of this court, the guideline calculation is affected by the enhancement for use of a computer required in this type of an offense, which adds two levels. This warrants a departure under 5K2.0 as a matter of standard practice in this court to achieve parity with others similarly situated to the offender, although the government is quite correct to point out the interactive nature of some of the defendant's apparently live shows over computers, which differentiates his conduct and will be a factor the Court will also consider under Section 3553(a).

With this two-level downward departure, it leaves the defendant a total offense level of 28. Coupled with his criminal history category of I, the guideline imprisonment range here is 78 to 97 months, and that's where the Court will begin thinking about an appropriate sentence for this defendant.

Admittedly, some of the images and some of the texts from this defendant, no matter how the defense attempts to

characterize them as simply being provocative, are quite disturbing and justify a substantial sentence both out of concern for this defendant and particularly out of concern for protection of the public, but he is a first offender, and notwithstanding the government's reasonable argument that he may have been offending for some time, the fact is he's only been — he's never been convicted of a crime of any kind, and that is a factor I will consider along with what I think is inarguably his likely vulnerability while incarcerated.

And with that, I'll hear first from the government and then from the defendant.

MS. ALTMAN: I don't have anything to add to my sentencing memo, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good.

MR. JONES: I think I may have heard you say that after the adjustment, the removal of the use of computer, the guideline was 28. If I heard wrong -- I think you meant 18,

unless you did say 18 and I misheard, but it's 18, criminal

Mr. Jones, is there anything you want to add to your memo?

20 history I --

2.3

THE COURT: The offense level is 28. It was 30.

MR. JONES: Oh, okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: That's what I said was 28.

MR. JONES: Understood. I thought you said something

about 20, criminal history I, but that --

THE COURT: No. He has a criminal history category of I and an offense level of 28 after reducing for the two computer points, which gives him a guideline range of 78 to 87 [verbatim] months. MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: No, that's fine.

> I appreciate it. I just wanted to --Anything else you want to add, Mr. Jones? THE COURT:

MR. JONES: Just -- I wrote a sentencing memo.

that --

MR. JONES:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: And I did read it with care.

MR. JONES: You obviously gave it some consideration based upon comments you've already made. It was my position that it does suggest that there may be more a search for shocking communication and interaction which was what was being sought versus the actual images, but that's, I guess, speculation. I can't really say what the anticipated reaction was. The reality is, as Mr. Tjader has come to hear multiple times -- I'm sure it's sinking is -- is it really doesn't matter. It could lead people to behavior, and I don't know that he fully had thought that through. That is just, I guess, the mitigating argument that I had provided to the Court.

I also point out that there's family statements of support. They suggest that, having observed him growing up, that he was in a healthy atmosphere, and I think that that suggests that

2.3

someone such as Mr. Tjader may have less of a road to rehabilitation and realization of the correct behavior in our community. He also demonstrated a good work history, lengthy, consistent employment, and good comments from his employer.

So I do rely primarily on the sentencing memo and my comments in there to advocate for a sentence of 60 months.

THE COURT: Mr. Tjader, is there anything you'd like to say before I render sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not good at public speaking. Yes. Give me a couple minutes.

THE COURT: Sure. Take the time you need.

It's not necessary that you speak. You certainly have a right to do so, and you can also ask statements be made on your behalf by your counsel. I'm happy to proceed on any basis you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor -- sorry. Nervous habit.

Your Honor, I am sorry about that, and I obviously need help

but -- I have been -- since the day I was picked up, I have

actually been trying to, if any way possible, help the FBI in

anything if they need it, but they obviously don't need my help.

THE COURT: One of the interesting things about your case is how long you've been involved in online pornography.

You seem to have sort of entered in about the same time that peer-to-peer or computer access was possible and have somewhat grown with the development in that you were involved in a fairly

sophisticated exchange of images from the Philippines.

2.3

THE DEFENDANT: You want to hear something even more interesting? Although I've had computers for a really long time, I don't know a lot about computers. I mean, I figured out how to use Limewire -- that's obvious -- but I didn't know how to -- like they told me Ares. Did I download Ares online? Probably. I don't remember using it ever. I've downloaded lots of programs that I maybe attempted to use a couple of times but couldn't figure them out and then just left them alone, but they're still on my computer.

THE COURT: But you also used some of those programs to reach into parts of the internet that are not easily accessed and to do so repeatedly.

THE DEFENDANT: If that's the case, that would have been accidental because, like I said, I'm not really good at use of computers, and I'm not sure what you're talking about by what parts of the internet are not easily accessible.

THE COURT: Your experience was mostly online through a Yahoo! account? What other methods did you use to communicate?

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, the Yahoo! account, I actually did not set that up. I was on -- well, it was Limewire. I used Yahoo! and Facebook. Facebook was just recent but --

THE COURT: And Gmail accounts and other email accounts of various kinds.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. But Yahoo! Messenger, I

```
1
       couldn't -- I didn't set that up. I was on a legal site talking
 2
       to somebody -- it was a legal adult website talking to somebody
 3
       who on that site set it up for me. This is, I don't know,
 4
       back --
 5
                THE COURT: And it's your representation to me that
       Limewire, the Asstr, the Ares, and the GigaTribe --
 6
 7
                THE DEFENDANT: That what? What was that last one?
 8
                THE COURT: You're telling me you don't -- that someone
 9
       else set up all of those for you?
10
                THE DEFENDANT: No, no, just the Yahoo! Messenger. I
       didn't --
11
12
                THE COURT: But you downloaded Limewire. You
       downloaded Asstr, the A-S-S-T-R site --
13
14
                THE DEFENDANT: Asstr is just a website.
15
                THE COURT: You downloaded Ares?
                THE DEFENDANT: Ares? I might have. I don't remember.
16
17
       I don't know how to use it and never have.
                THE COURT: And gained access to GigaTribe. You just
18
19
       don't recognize it as a name?
20
                THE DEFENDANT: I have never even heard of GigaTribe
21
       that I know of. I might have downloaded --
22
                THE COURT: These are some of the sites and programs
2.3
       that were on your computer. That's why I ask.
24
                THE DEFENDANT: Like I said, I have downloaded lots of
25
       stuff onto my computer that I don't -- that I may have attempted
```

1 to use once or twice and never successfully used it, so I just 2 gave up on it. 3 THE COURT: Some of these messages there's thousands of 4 exchanges, so you were using something regularly. 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I used Yahoo! Messenger 6 regularly up until --7 THE COURT: Until you moved to Facebook. 8 THE DEFENDANT: Well, no. There was, like, four years 9 between the two. 10 THE COURT: Understood. 11 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 12 THE COURT: I'm saying you used Yahoo!, and then later 13 you used Facebook. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yeah. 15 MR. JONES: Since we're getting into the details, 16 Judge, the Facebook was set up among his friends for -- because 17 they do a Dungeons & Dragons group, and they were just using it 18 for chat, and actually the evidence is quite clear that this 19 Santos McBride [verbatim] found his name through Facebook and 20 started messaging him. So I just want to clarify that he didn't 21 just hop on Facebook for that sole purpose. 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. 2.3 THE COURT: And, Counsel, Ms. Altman, do you know whether this defendant used more sophisticated communication 24 25 means than those we've just discussed? In other words, any

1 access through the dark side of the web through special 2 software. 3 MS. ALTMAN: There's no indication of that, Your Honor, 4 of using like an anonymizing program or anything like that. 5 There's no evidence of that. 6 THE COURT: The other thing is that you were very 7 specific in some of the things you asked for, and it's hard to imagine that that just came out of thin air. You obviously have 8 9 a fascination with really disturbing images. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Talking about, yes. Watching, no. 11 THE COURT: But you got images back. I don't know how 12 you can say "Watching, no." 13 THE DEFENDANT: Well, or live -- live demonstrations, 14 no. 15 THE COURT: Well, then why are there the repeated 16 requests for live demonstrations? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Nothing has come of it. 18 THE COURT: That's not what the text exchange says. 19 The text exchange says that they could get it for you and that 20 you sent money -- you sent over \$5,000 worth of money through 21 Western Union for images, some of them apparently for live 22 images, although those weren't preserved. It's hard -- you can

understand why, when I'm trying to understand what happened

here, it's hard to credit the notion that you didn't ask for and

enjoy receiving and viewed some very disturbing images. And, I

2.3

24

25

```
1
       mean, you've admitted your quilt here. I'm just trying to
 2
       better understand what it is -- what conduct you engaged in, and
       your effort to minimize it as "It's just things I asked for"
 3
 4
       doesn't seem very credible.
 5
            I'm trying to find a reference to in your -- you attended
 6
       camps as a child or did you also -- were you also attending
 7
       camps as an adult?
                THE DEFENDANT: Camp -- well, "camp" is misleading.
 8
 9
       The WCC, I don't know if you ever heard of it --
10
                THE COURT: I have, yeah.
11
                THE DEFENDANT: That's what she meant was WCC.
12
                THE COURT: And when did you do that?
13
                THE DEFENDANT: I want to say '95, somewhere around
14
       there.
15
                THE COURT: And just for one year?
16
                THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. It's a one-year -- well, you get
17
       a job. You only work for one year, unless you become a -- I
18
       don't remember what they call it but basically like a boss
19
       underneath the supervisor. Then you get another year.
20
                THE COURT: All right. And so you did it for one year?
21
                THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
22
                THE COURT: Is there anything else that you'd care to
2.3
       add before I render sentence?
24
                MR. JONES: Could I just have one second?
25
                THE COURT: Sure.
```

1 (Discussion held off the record between the defendant and 2 Mr. Jones.) 3 MR. JONES: Judge, Mr. Tjader wanted me to explain to you that he recalls the first time he asked for something really 4 5 shocking, there was kind of a pause, and nothing came of it, and 6 that's why he was proceeding in these chats without a real 7 compelling belief that many of these things that he was throwing 8 out there would actually come to fruition. He just wanted to 9 make that statement. 10 THE COURT: Did you want to clarify that? 11 THE DEFENDANT: I just -- one thing I wanted to add to 12 The first time I did, actually I got kind of scared when 13 there was a pause, and then she came back on. Nothing happened 14 because I didn't want anything to happen like that. I wasn't 15 thinking when I said it and just --16 THE COURT: But then you proceeded to make lots of 17 requests, and you got responses. 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, but nothing came of it so --THE COURT: I don't know what that means, "nothing came 19 20 of it." Much came of it over time. 21 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Responses came of it but --22 THE COURT: You sent them \$5,000. 2.3 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. 24 THE COURT: You must have gotten something for that. 25 THE DEFENDANT: I've gotten shows.

THE COURT: You've gotten lots of stuff, and apparently there's gaps as to live images.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

1.3

2.3

THE COURT: You've thought through this to try to minimize it, but it doesn't come across as very credible.

THE DEFENDANT: And I've gotten shows, mostly adult, and nothing violent.

THE COURT: I don't know how you can say that with some of the images that are on your computer.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, for the live shows.

THE COURT: But the things you requested in the live shows were quite violent.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, but nothing -- but I got nothing violent.

THE COURT: I am prepared to render sentence. The defendant is a 44-year-old man before the Court for his first criminal conviction of any kind. He was an only child born to parents who reportedly were nurturing and held the defendant to reasonable, consistent expectations. Overall, he is described by his family as introverted and quiet but pleasant to be around. As a child, the defendant was engrossed in playing video games, and he continues to describe video games as his only passion in life. Although his mother has questioned the defendant's cognitive abilities throughout his life, he graduated from high school and has maintained stable employment

since. Nevertheless, the defendant has resided with his mother for the entirety of his life, primarily in the basement ostensibly because she is no longer able to care for the space herself. The defendant reports never having a meaningful romantic relationship, but he has sustained close relationships with his family and a few friends.

The defendant's criminal conduct is more egregious than what is typically seen in receipt of child pornography cases.

In 2017, an ongoing investigation revealed the defendant had received images of child pornography from sources in the Philippines, including an individual from whom he requested specific, graphic child pornography images and live stream video in exchange for payment.

In October 2017, the defendant was arrested by case agents at his home in Maple, Wisconsin, where they seized computer equipment. As I've already indicated, a forensic analysis of that equipment determined the defendant's conduct involved 138 images and 118 videos containing child pornography, even after accounting for duplicate images. The images depicted the sexual abuse of girls as young as infancy through the age of 14, including vaginal penetration. The defendant also admitted using several peer-to-peer programs. The defendant not only received child pornography through email and peer-to-peer programs but, as I've said, made specific requests for live stream videos that depicted the sexual abuse of children and

2.3

solicited images for payment. The defendant requested specific items to take place over live video, including a person having sex with a 6-year-old child, a child having sex with a dog, killing a young child, and injuring a female child's genitals. These requests were sadistic and abusive in nature. The defendant admitted to and demonstrated a pattern of behavior that spanned over 15 years, and given the graphic nature of some of his requests, it's hard to accept any explanation than the defendant's fascination, perhaps addiction, to frightening images.

Finally, the defendant agreed to participate in a polygraph examination, failing the relevant questions when asked if he had ever had sexual contact with a child. That is hardly definitive proof, but it is a further basis for concern by the Court.

Were it not for his first offender status and cognitive limitations, a sentence at the top of the guideline would seem in order. Taking into consideration the nature of the offense as well as the defendant's personal history and characteristics, I am persuaded that a custodial sentence in the middle of the guideline range is reasonable and no greater than necessary to hold the defendant accountable, protect the community, provide the defendant the opportunity for rehabilitative programs, and achieve parity with the sentences of similarly situated offenders.

As to Count 1 of the indictment, it is adjudged that the

2.3

defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 84 months. I strongly recommend that he be placed in an institution capable of addressing both his vulnerable status and need for psychiatric and sex offender counseling. I also recommend that he be afforded prerelease placement in a residential re-entry center with work release privileges and ongoing sex offender programming.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the primary goals of supervised release are to assist defendant's transition into the community after a term of imprisonment and to provide rehabilitation. Supervision in this case will provide the defendant with needed correctional programming, including rehabilitative programs, to assist with community reintegration; afford adequate deterrence to further criminal conduct; and protect the public from further crimes perpetrated by the defendant.

In particular, the offense of conviction, having involved internet chats and communications with a third party in the Philippines from 2012 to 2014 in which he made specific requests for extreme child pornography, demonstrates the need to closely monitor his communications online, as do the long-term viewing habits of child pornography by this defendant and the cache of photos and videos found in his computer equipment, including long email -- or I'm sorry -- sizable email attachments. While the defendant denies having had physical sexual contact with a

2.3

child, the concern of the Court is that that may not be true and, in any event, that there is a risk to society with this defendant, further justifying the detailed supervision requirements of the Court. The defendant also will likely need extensive help reintegrating with society upon his release, even with his ability to maintain steady employment and share expenses. Accordingly, his term of imprisonment is to be followed by a ten-year term of supervised release.

In light of the nature of the offense and the defendant's personal history, I adopt conditions 1 through 4, 7 through 9, and 11 through 19 as proposed and justified in the presentence report. The defendant raised written objections to Conditions Nos. 12 through 14, 16, and 19 in the revised report. Similar objections have been raised before this court in the past and denied, most recently in *United States v. Robert Tlusty*. The Court notes that should circumstances or the law change before or during the defendant's term of supervised release, the defendant will certainly have an opportunity to address concerns of that nature to this court. In the meantime, I do overrule each of the objections for the following reasons:

As to Special Condition No. 12, financial monitoring conditions are certainly necessary based on the nature of the offense, including solicitation of images for payment. The probation office will need to monitor financial records of this defendant, including credit card statements for the purchase of

2.3

computer equipment, internet services, illicit materials, as well as to evaluate the defendant's characteristics or capability to make payments of treatment costs. The defendant's personal characteristics include outstanding debts and liabilities of over \$20,000. In addition, he will be required to pay not only the statutory assessment but ongoing state and federal income taxes during his supervision period. Since this financial monitoring condition is not overly burdensome and serves the statutory purposes of sentencing and rehabilitation, I do find it to be necessary and in compliance with -- to assure compliance with the defendant's legal and financial obligations.

Special conditions 13 and 14 are appropriate to deter the defendant from offense-related behaviors and to provide monitoring to ensure the safety of the community. Since the defendant previously communicated with others online in profoundly disturbing ways through file sharing and received child pornography using a computer, various forms of monitoring software will be necessary and may be installed on the computers of the defendant, including electronic devices, after he is released to supervision. Any electronic item seized from the defendant based on suspicion of contraband will also necessarily be subject to further forensic analysis. Currently there is no statutory provision under Section 3583(d) in which a time frame must be established to return these items, and I will not impose strict deadlines for the return of any property removed for

2.3

inspection during supervision. However, I will require that any property be returned as soon as possible after inspection unless the inspection is based on a reasonable suspicion that the property is or contains contraband. In that case, return of the property will be at the discretion of the supervising officer, and if opposed by the defendant, then he may seek release from this court.

Special Condition No. 16, while not recommended by the defendant, is a condition that includes Abel Screening and plethysmograph testing. This recommended condition is centered around treatment and polygraph testing to be used as a treatment tool. Although the test results are not admissible as evidence at trial, testing instruments may be used to assist the treatment provider with addressing offense behavior and to monitor the defendant to ensure community safety. Accordingly, use of such methods shall be at the treatment provider's discretion.

Finally, Special Condition No. 19 was objected to regarding the constitutionality of the sex offender registry as being overly broad. Given that this defendant has been convicted of child pornography, there is little evidence to conclude he is a child predator, but it remains a concern of this court, and, therefore, at this point, since registration is required by SORNA in both state and federal law, I am of the view that that registration should be mandatory under the conditions imposed by

2.3

the Court as well, if for no other reason than it may prevent any risk the defendant does pose to children.

If, when the defendant is released from confinement — well, I guess, Mr. Jones, there is a question for you at this point. I've justified the individual conditions that you've raised an objection to, but there remains some question as to whether I should read into the record each of the individual special conditions or conditions being imposed and justify each of them individually unless the defense wishes to waive my doing so, in which case I would incorporate the conditions verbatim as well as the individual justifications along with those that I've already set forth.

MR. JONES: Right. There's no need -- we would waive the reading of any justification of the additional conditions that we did not object to.

THE COURT: All right. And you have an understanding and you've reviewed the basic conditions with your client?

MR. JONES: Yes. Mr. Tjader had his PSR for some time and was able to review them and talk to me, so we've had plenty of time -- so he is aware of those conditions and their justification.

THE COURT: Mr. Tjader, the only additional thing about those conditions is when you're released, if you or the probation office or both believe that any of the conditions no longer are appropriate, you are welcome to come back to court,

and I would consider revisions to those conditions.

2.3

The instant offense is not drug related, and the defendant has no history of drug use. Therefore, the requirement for drug testing is waived under Section 3583(d).

It is adjudged the defendant is to pay a \$100 criminal assessment penalty to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin as required by statute. That is due immediately following sentencing.

But the defendant -- well, the defendant is to pay a mandatory restitution to the U.S. Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin. My understanding is that the parties have not yet agreed on a restitution amount, so pursuant to Section 3664(d)(5) of Title 18, I will hold a restitution hearing on September 7, 2018, at 1:00 p.m., although I encourage the parties to see if they can reach some understanding as to the amount before then.

I do find the defendant lacks the means to pay any further fine under Section 5E1.C -- 1.2(c) without impairing his ability to support himself upon release from custody.

I also find that he is indigent and that the \$5,000 assessment under the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 is waived.

A final order of forfeiture will also be issued under Section 2259 consistent with the parties' stipulation, but I will grant that order today as well.

2.3

Finally, the U.S. Probation Office is to notify local law enforcement agencies and the state attorney general of the defendant's release back to the community.

I believe there are two counts that need to be dismissed at this stage, Counsel?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor, Counts 2 and 3.

THE COURT: Counts 2 and 3 are dismissed, and, Mr.

Tjader, my last obligation is to ensure that you understand that you have a right to appeal my sentence. You have been represented ably by Mr. Jones, and I'm confident that he would discuss possible grounds for an appeal as well as assist you in filing a notice of appeal if you wish to do so, but you only have 14 days, so you should have that conversation sooner rather than later.

I am hopeful that there may be some benefit to the programming that is available in the federal system. Your first few months in that system will be discombobulating. They'll be confusing because you'll be moved from various institutions, but I will note my strong recommendation that you end up in a facility that has an opportunity for real programming as well as is cognizant of the nature of the facility that is best for you.

THE DEFENDANT: Am I going to be here until the --

THE COURT: The restitution hearing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, that thing.

THE COURT: That's an excellent question, and I don't

```
1
       know the answer to that. You can participate by phone if the
 2
       Bureau of Prisons decides to move you during this period, but we
       will address that down the road with counsel.
 3
            Is there anything more for the government at this time?
 4
 5
                MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor.
                                               Thank you.
 6
                THE COURT: Anything more for the defense?
 7
                MR. JONES: No.
                AGENT JOHNSON: Your Honor, could I just clarify one
 8
       thing for the record? Special Condition No. 16, the probation
 9
10
       office didn't recommend Abel Screening or plethysmograph
11
       testing, only the polygraph testing.
12
                THE COURT: And that's what I noted, but I'm not going
13
       to restrict it. I'm going to allow the provider to determine
14
       what of those tests, if any, are appropriate for this defendant.
15
                AGENT JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
16
                THE COURT: Is there anything else?
                MR. JONES:
17
                            No.
18
                MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
                THE CLERK: All rise. This court stands in recess.
19
20
             (Proceedings concluded at 1:56 p.m.)
                                    * * *
21
22
23
24
25
```

I, JENNIFER L. DOBBRATZ, Certified Realtime and Merit 1 2 Reporter in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that the 3 foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings held on the 2nd day of July, 2018, before the Honorable 4 5 William M. Conley, U.S. District Judge for the Western District 6 of Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in 7 accordance with my stenographic notes made at said time and 8 place. 9 Dated this 17th day of July, 2018. 10 11 12 1.3 14 15 \_/s/ Jennifer L. Dobbratz\_ 16 Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC Federal Court Reporter 17 18 19 20 21 22 2.3 24 The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter. 25